

## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **February 21-22, 2008**

Doubletree Guest Suites Anaheim Resort/Convention Center  
2085 S. Harbor Blvd.  
Anaheim, CA 92802

#### ***Thursday, February 21***

##### Members Present

Ian Russ, Chair, MFT Member  
Elise Froistad, MFT Member  
Judy Johnson, LEP Member  
Karen Roye, Public Member  
Renee Lonner, LCSW Member  
Victor Perez, Public Member  
Joan Walmsley, Vice Chair, LCSW Member  
Gordonna DiGiorgio, Public Member

##### Members Absent

Victor Law, Public Member  
D'Karla Leach, Public Member  
Rita Cameron Wedding, Public Member

##### Staff Present

Paul Riches, Executive Officer  
Mona Maggio, Assistant Executive Officer  
Kristy Schieldge, Legal Counsel  
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Assistant

##### Guest List

On file

#### ***FULL BOARD OPEN SESSION***

Ian Russ called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m. Christina Kitamura called roll, and a quorum was established.

#### **I. Petition for Reinstatement**

##### **A. Lidia Zoila Waller, MFC 31054**

Daniel Juarez, Administrative Law Judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings, briefly explained the procedures for the proceeding.

The hearing began at 8:40 a.m. Board members stated their names for the record. Thomas Rinaldi, Deputy Attorney General, represented the People of the State of California. Lidia Zoila Waller, petitioner, represented herself.

Mr. Rinaldi presented documents submitted for the Board's consideration in the matter. Ms. Waller claimed that she did not receive the documents. Ms. Waller was then provided with the documents and given an opportunity to review the documents.

Mr. Rinaldi stated that it was the Attorney General's opinion that the petition should not be granted. Mr. Rinaldi provided a brief case overview.

Ms. Waller testified on her own behalf. Mr. Rinaldi asked several questions for Ms. Waller's response. Board members also asked questions for Ms. Waller's response.

David Fraser, Executive Director of Inland Care Giver Resource Center, testified as a witness for Ms. Waller. Mr. Rinaldi asked several questions for Mr. Fraser's response. Board members also asked questions for Mr. Fraser's response.

Both parties made closing arguments. The hearing ended and the record was closed at 10:40 a.m.

The Board adjourned for a break at 10:40 a.m. and reconvened for full board closed session at 10:51 a.m.

#### ***FULL BOARD CLOSED SESSION***

#### **II. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3) to Deliberate on Disciplinary Decisions**

##### **A. Petition for Reinstatement (Lidia Zoila Waller, MFC 31054)**

##### **B. Proposed Stipulation (Brian Kenneth Chesher, MFC 28326)**

Full board closed session ended at 12:13 p.m. The Board adjourned for lunch and reconvened at 1:02 p.m. for the full board open session.

#### ***FULL BOARD OPEN SESSION***

#### **III. Introductions**

Ian Russ welcomed guests in attendance. Audience members introduced themselves.

#### **IV. Approval of November 8-9, 2007 Meeting Minutes**

***Joan Walmsley moved to approve the November 8-9, 2007 board meeting minutes. Judy Johnson seconded. The Board voted unanimously (8-0) to pass the motion.***

#### **V. Discussion of Examination Complaints**

Patrick Thompson addressed the Board regarding the licensing process for clinical social workers and his experience with the process, and requested corrective action to be taken. Mr. Thompson was a license clinical social worker in Washington D.C. When he moved to California, he discovered that California did not offer reciprocity. Mr. Thompson took the exam and did not pass. He feels that the reason he did not pass is because PSI, the former test vendor, failed to give him correct information. He was told that the exam had 40 questions, 10 of which were pre-test items. He was also told that the clock would not start until he completed

the pre-test items. Mr. Thompson stated that the clock started at the beginning of the pre-test items.

Mr. Thompson questioned the validity of the exam and noted the varying pass rates. He also compared the exam pass rates to those of the Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) exam. Mr. Thompson noted that examination issues are not an ongoing discussion at each board meeting, and feels that it should be an ongoing discussion. He stated that to not offer reciprocity creates a challenge for out-of-state licensees, the state and consumers.

Mr. Thompson outlined his personal experiences and described them as frustrating. He wrote a letter to the Board of Behavioral Sciences (BBS) and stated that he never received a response. He contacted the office several times to inquire about the board meeting agenda, in which he was consistently told that the agenda was not set. Once the agenda was set, he discovered that this issue was not included on the agenda, and he would be given an opportunity to address the Board at the end of the meeting under "Public Comments." Subsequently, the issue was placed on the agenda. Mr. Thompson added that his intention was not to make a complaint, but to give feedback.

Dr. Russ asked Mr. Thompson what he is requesting of the Board. Mr. Thompson replied that he wanted an indication as to whether the Board is considering the ASWB exam, if the Board intends to continue with the current exam, and if the Board will allow the exam to be independently tested.

Dr. Russ stated that he would respond to some of the issues in his report on the next agenda item.

Ms. Johnson asked Mr. Thompson if he received the response in a letter dated February 12, 2008, signed by Paul Riches. Mr. Thompson replied that he did not receive the response. Mr. Riches stated that a response was mailed to Mr. Thompson. Ms. Johnson provided a copy of the letter and an attached document to Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Riches added that a review of the ASWB exam is proceeding. A psychometrician, Tracy Montez, was retained by BBS to perform an audit of the national exam. Renee Lonner, Joan Walmsley and Tracy Montez are visiting ACT Center, the exam administrator for ASWB, in March. They will report back at the May Board meeting.

Victor Perez added that California does not offer reciprocity for any profession. California develops its own exams. The Board has say over the administration of the exam, and the Board is taking steps to ensure that it is a properly administered exam and that it meets California standards.

## **VI. Chairperson's Report**

### **A. Future Board Committee Activity**

Dr. Russ reported that even though exam issues and concerns are not on each agenda, it is an ongoing discussion. Concerns are brought to the Board on a regular basis by professional organizations and individuals. There are procedures to follow, which include gathering experts from the field, performing occupational analyses, training subject matter experts to develop questions. The questions are tested, and psychometricians analyze the performance of the questions.

Dr. Russ stated that there have been ongoing discussions regarding BBS's involvement with the national exams and reciprocity. He expressed concern about the complaints received. In order to look into these matters, Dr. Russ is appointing a committee to

evaluate the issues regarding the exams. The committee will consult with a psychometrician and determine how the Board can construct an exam that represents the needs of California that is legitimate and fair. The committee will address issues regarding particular exam questions and determine if they are performing properly. Elise Froistad will chair the committee. Joan Walmsley will serve on the committee. Dr. Russ requested that one board public member serve on the committee.

Renee Lonner and Joan Walmsley will be traveling to Iowa in March to review the ASWB exam. They will report their findings to this committee when they return.

The committees will be reorganized. The Consumer Protection Committee and the Policy and Advocacy Committee will be combined under one committee: Policy and Advocacy Committee. Donna DiGiorgio will continue to chair this committee. The committee will include members Karen Roye, Renee Lonner, and Ian Russ. This committee will meet quarterly throughout the state.

## **B. Professional Ethics Review Process**

Ethics are designed for particular types of practice: confidentiality, privacy, and one-to-one medical model orientation. As we move into a field of community-based services that required a different ethics model, where in some cases a relationship between a mental health provider and client is sometimes necessary for recovery, for example, assisting a client to find housing. Currently, this is conceived as a “dual relationship,” and the Board needs to find a way to approach that.

This committee will meet during each Board meeting and discuss the ongoing ethics issues. The committee will be comprised of all Board members.

Dr. Russ appointed a new committee: Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) Committee. Joan Walmsley and one Board public member will serve on this committee, with Renee Lonner as the chair. This purpose of this committee is to gather the social work community and have an open discussion to ultimately inform the Board regarding the social worker in California: The definition of social worker, the role of the social worker, training and background, what should be tested and should not be tested, is the social worker meeting the needs of the agencies.

This committee will be the opportunity for the social work community to inform the Board and have open discussions and debates, so that the Board can be informed about the nature of clinical social workers that the Board is responsible for licensing, for testing, and for holding accountable to standards.

Mr. Riches stated that this is an ambitious agenda for Board members and staff. This year will also be a busy legislative year. This requires staff and Board members to pull back on other routine business to create room to take on the larger issues. The energy and resources will be focused on the substantial issues.

Janlee Wong, Executive Director of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) California Chapter, had several questions regarding the Exam Committee: What is the purpose of the Exam Committee? Is the purpose of the Exam Committee to be a gatekeeper? Is the purpose to filter out people before they become licensed? Is the purpose to measure competence in terms of knowledge, thinking, and/or practice skills?

Mr. Wong added the Board should have goals and objectives, and expected outcomes for both newly formed committees. He requested that the Board be upfront and acknowledge

that there is a possibility that the Board will move forward to change the LCSW law or regulations.

Dr. Russ stated that one of the possibilities is that the Board review and change the LCSW law.

Mr. Wong stated that with the creation of the Exam Review Committee and the LCSW Education Committee there appears to be a connection, which the reason there is a problem with the exam is because there is a problem with social work education. Mr. Wong urged the Board to approach these committees objectively and gather research and evidence when making public policy.

Mr. Wong questioned the role of the consumer, indicating that a consumer should be on the committees. The MHSA clearly states that consumers are to be hired as mental health workers. Consumers need to be brought to the table because they are receiving the education, trying to pass the exams, and trying to become LCSWs.

Mr. Wong explained that historically, social work is at least 100 years old or more. Before there was a license in 1964, the profession defined the practice of social work. Social work was not defined by the license. It appears that may be changing. The marriage and family therapist (MFT) license defines the MFT, and that is in statute. However, that is not the case with the LCSW.

Mr. Wong stated that he wants to see evidence and research in this process, and he wants everyone to make good public policy decisions for LCSWs and for social work in California.

Dr. Russ stated that this is going to be an educational process, and encouraged the committee to share literature with others on the BBS website, and to utilize and share relevant literature. The committee is going to determine how to include consumers in the process.

### **C. Supervision Workgroup Report and Possible Action to Approve Draft Curriculum for Supervisor Training**

Ms. Walmsley explained that MFT Interns and Associate Social Workers (ASW) are required by law to gain supervised hours of clinical experience to qualify to sit for their prospective licensure examinations. Clinical supervision is one component in developing an individual's competency to become licensed as an MFT or LCSW. She felt that people were struggling with exams because they were not receiving adequate supervision. The quality of supervision needs to be enhanced in the expectations.

Ms. Walmsley introduced Gary Henderson, MFT and Michael Brooks, LCSW. Mr. Henderson and Mr. Brooks worked with Ms. Walmsley on the Supervision Workgroup.

Mr. Henderson provides supervision in a private practice setting and conducts supervision courses to supervisors who work in a variety of employment settings. Mr. Henderson commended the Board for stepping up to the plate with regards to supervision. He stated that the quality and content of supervision has never been addressed. The workgroup was charged in developing a supervision plan that is broad enough to allow for specific types of environment settings, yet inclusive enough to cover the materials that were considered competent for the clinical community for MFTs and LCSWs. The workgroup researched supervision literature from NASW, California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (CAMFT), and the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT), to name a few. The workgroup developed a supervision outline, and it was presented to a few

groups. Mr. Henderson conducted a 6-hour supervision workshop to MFTs and LCSWs in the private sector, and another 6-hour workshop in the public sector. Feedback was received from both training courses.

Mr. Henderson stated that this outline will hopefully give supervisors and supervisees clear expectations of what is expected of a supervisor. There is a lot of misinformation and fears concerning supervision. This outline will elevate some of the fears, and may attract more competent licensees into supervision. The workgroup did not create anything new that did not already exist.

Mr. Brooks is a member of the American Board of Examiners in Clinical Social Work and assisted in the development of publications: *Clinical Supervision: A Practice Specialty of Clinical Social Work* and *Professional Development and Practice Competencies in Clinical Social Work*. Mr. Brooks stated that the charge from the Board is that the supervisees need to know what to expect from a supervisor, and the supervisors need to know what the expectations are and how to meet the expectations. The workgroup's goal was to compile information, make it definable, and make it available.

Ms. Walmsley stated that the workgroup compiled a list of suggested guidelines. One goal of supervision is to prepare people to practice independently. If they are not being prepared to practice independently, sufficiently by their supervisors, they will not pass the exam or will struggle to practice independently. Ms. Walmsley added that this is not a mandated course. The workgroup looked at the examinations, the expectations of both professions, and the training that people should be expected to get. And the workgroup came up with the suggested guidelines.

Ms. Maggio stated that staff evaluators field questions daily from supervisees and supervisors. Staff attended the pilot program that Mr. Henderson presented to Placer County agencies, and staff interacted with the individuals who provide supervision. Many of those calls are from people who want to become supervisors and want to know what they need to do. Many of the callers are licensees who have already taken a supervision course, and are calling to ask, "How do I become a supervisor?" Many of the licensees who want to help their profession are not getting information they needed from these courses. Staff heard the concerns of the supervisors, such as the shortage of supervisors, issues of working in agencies and having enough time to work with supervisees, and the paperwork.

Ms. Walmsley explained that many supervisors do not know the details of the paperwork, and how to complete the paperwork. That is a suggested guideline. Ms. Walmsley is going to take the AAMFT course and hopes to incorporate what she learns into the suggested guidelines.

Mary Riemersma, Executive Director of the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (CAMFT), asked how this course was intended to be used. With a course description, it appears that this is intended to be more than a model, a recommendation, or a suggestion. It appears that it is to become a standard. She is also concerned about the use of various models: AAMFT Approved Supervisor, CAMFT Certified Supervisor, Berkeley's Supervision Program, and other models. All of the models deliver in a different manner, all of which are good in their own perspective. There are also the differences between the professions. Clinical social work has a 15-hour course that the law specifies certain content that must be taken in advance. The MFTs are required to get 6 hours every two years. Another concern is that this model does not exist in any other way.

Ms. Riemersma stated that she appreciates the work put into this; however, this is a unique approach by the Board. In the development of something new, the Board allows the opportunity for the public to participate, and this was not handled in that manner. Ms. Riemersma wants the public involved as it is being developed, rather than putting this out for consideration. She stated that she is still not sure what the intent or purpose of this is.

Ms. Riemersma liked the brochures informing supervisees of the role of the supervisors. She also reminded the Board regarding its surveys of supervisees, which reflected positive results about the value of supervision they received.

Mr. Riches responded to Ms. Riemersma's concerns. He stated that supervisees give the Board a lot of positive feedback about supervision; the surveys indicate that they have positive experiences. The Board receives a lot of feedback from the supervisors who are mystified about what they should be doing. There were no common understandings about expectations and how supervisors should operate. He explained that the goal is to stimulate the community to arrive at that common understanding about supervision experiences. He explained that we are at the beginning, and trying to figure out what is the irreducible minimum. There are different professions and supervision in different settings; but there are going to be basic things that ought to occur in any supervision relationship, and that is what the workgroup is trying to identify. The workgroup is trying to identify it in a manner that is respectful to the fact that there are different certification programs for supervisors, different schools of thought about supervision, and distinct professions to address. The charge was to find the irreducible common minimum that is about what learning experience looks like. Learning experience needs to contain certain types of information regardless of what the profession or setting is going to be. Mr. Riches also emphasized that this was brought to a committee meeting last year, and an initial draft was presented. The committee received some comments, which were incorporated.

Mr. Riches added that supervision is a learning process, and it ought to be structured as a learning process. Mr. Riches agreed that this is odd compared to how things are usually approached, but that was driven by a problem that is not a typical problem for the Board. This is not a mandate, and it is not intended to be a mandate. The intent was to stimulate discussion with the professions with what the irreducible minimums ought to be, and some clarity on what the supervision relationship should look like.

Olivia Loewy, Executive Director of the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) California Division, asked if this is a course as it was presented, or is it a set of guidelines for what may be included in a future course.

Mr. Brooks responded that Mr. Henderson presented a course that he would deliver based on those guidelines. Somebody else could develop a course and use those guidelines. It is a tool to use to think about the elements that could go into a good supervision course – it is not intended to dictate the content and how the content should be presented.

Ms. Loewy noted that the material stated it was a course outline, but instructional objectives were missing. She was concerned with the implication that supervision of MFTs and social workers were interchangeable and can be covered in 6 hours of one course. Supervisors of MFTs need 6 hours, and social workers need 15 hours; it does not make sense. Additionally, it is important when supervising MFTs to cover those areas that train and promote a person to work as an MFT, and that is not general – it is very specific. That is a way of promoting and maintaining the profession. Ms. Loewy added that perhaps there is a place for a prerequisite or two types of courses: a course in basic training that is covered by the outline and a course that is in depth on how to supervise.

Geri Esposito, Executive Director of the California Society for Clinical Social Work (CSCSW), agreed with Ms. Riemersma. Ms. Esposito understood from the prior meeting that these were parameters, which she is comfortable with. The choice of language included the word “shall” repeatedly. Ms. Esposito stated that clarification on what the Board wanted to convey with the guidelines would have made the document less misunderstood.

Catherine Wexler, Phillips Graduate Institute, stated that her understanding of the Board was not education, and that is not the Board’s mandate. This is a very specific piece of curriculum, and it seems as if the Board is getting into the education business. The one very important purpose of the guidelines is to motivate more people to become supervisors. A course like this may de-motivate rather than increase the number of people willing to supervise. Most people who are supervising in an agency or community organization need to do supervision based on the requirements of that agency.

Mr. Riches addressed several points: 1) The Board conducted a pilot test for a reason. It was clear that the licensees came out feeling more comfortable about their roles as supervisors. 2) This is not a mandate. 3) Respectful of the diverse populations, the diverse practice settings, and the diverse professional affiliations, there are irreducible minimums that need to take place in a learning environment. Mr. Riches added that people could take what they want from the guidelines if it is helpful.

Ben Caldwell, AAMFT California and Alliant International University, expressed concern that this was both developed and pilot tested before receiving external input.

Mr. Riches stated again that this was brought forth last year at a committee meeting. Mr. Henderson was present at that meeting, and a lot of feedback was received and incorporated.

Mr. Caldwell stated that if the BBS is a regulatory and enforcement body, and BBS puts this out as a recommended supervision course, people would see this as mandatory. He also stated that the BBS has not traditionally been in business of making polite recommendations.

Ms. Maggio responded that amended language was set out on the table prior to the start of the Board meeting. It is no longer called “Recommended Guidelines.” It is now called “Suggested Guidelines.” Also, the words “shall” were changed to “should.”

Mr. Caldwell stated that this does not alleviate the problem. He referred to the memo stating that currently there is no accurate way to measure the quality of supervision that interns and associates receive. The course objectives listed are shortened versions of what is in the course outline. The course objectives are not written in a way in which they can be demonstrated as learning outcomes, and doesn’t solve the problem of determining how well the course has worked in training a supervisor. As for the resources listed, it is very social-work heavy. There is a substantial amount of literature in MFT supervision, and Mr. Caldwell would be happy to contribute resources.

Mr. Riches and Ms. Walmsley accepted Mr. Caldwell’s offer to provide literature in MFT supervision.



Dr. Russ suggested taking this back to the Policy and Advocacy Committee, and in the interim, invite written comments. He also had some concerns with the bibliography. Dr. Russ suggested more discussion on this.

## **VII. Executive Officer's Report**

### **A. Budget Update**

Mr. Riches reported that although it is a troubling year from the general fund perspective, it is a good year for BBS fund. The Board advanced three Budget Change Proposals (BPC) that were approved. The budget includes two investigative analyst positions for the Board's enforcement unit.

Mr. Riches reported that the customer satisfaction surveys have consistently articulated a demand for more hands on help navigating the licensure process. The budget includes an additional position in the Board's licensing program to improve customer service. The position will focus on responding to applicant inquiries related to licensing processes and requirements.

The budget includes \$200,000 in added Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) funding for hiring consultants in public mental health and psychometrics to advise the Board on aligning current programs and policies with the treatment model proposed in the MHSA.

Mr. Riches provided clarification regarding the Governor's Executive Order to implement a hiring freeze and 1 1/2% reduction. That order was directed toward general fund agencies. BBS does not receive general fund monies; therefore the executive order does not affect BBS.

At the November board meeting, Mr. Riches reported that the budget projections were tight. He outlined measures that would be taken to address that situation. Those measures were implemented. The projections reflect approximately a \$100,00 year-end reserve. The projections improve every month.

Ms. Roye asked if staff budgeted sufficiently for benefit costs. She also noted the budget reduction in attorney general costs, but want to know why the budget for the administrative hearing costs was increased.

Mr. Riches replied that those numbers are estimated at the beginning of the year. The attorney general expenses are way up. There are some offsetting expenses on the exam administration side that is washing it out. There is flexibility to offset expenses in other areas. There are significant increases in enforcement activity.

Ms. Roye asked if the additional workload and costs are reflected in the budget request for next fiscal year. Mr. Riches replied no. He explained that the state budget released in January was constructed last August. The turn around time to cycle increases in and out of programs is about an 18-month cycle. Currently, staff is looking at the 2009-2010 fiscal year. BBS lives in three budget years at a time: last year, current year, and next year. He stated that for 2008-2009, the attorney general line will be much in line with this year's allocation.

Ms. Roye noted that the external contracts line exceeds allotment by 4 times, and the plan is to exceed it. She suggested budgeting additional dollars in that line item so that staff does not have to go back to seek allocations.

Mr. Riches responded that most of those contracts will be expiring in 2008-2009 fiscal year. The allocations are made by the Department of Finance, and in order to increase them, we have to go through a formal BCP.

**B. Quarterly Licensing Statistics**

Dr. Russ commended staff on the numbers and processing times, stating that the numbers and turn-around time are astounding.

**C. Personnel Update**

Mr. Riches reported on organizational changes. For the first time, the BBS has a management team in place. The Board has long been limited by an inadequate management structure. A few years ago, the Board had only the executive officer and an assistant executive officer to manage and supervise an office staff of 30. It is difficult to support staff and poses a big challenge for supervision in an environment of changing and improving outcomes. There is now a manager over the license, exam and cashiering units and a manager over the enforcement program that continues to grow.

Ms. Maggio's role will change significantly with the new management team in place. She is going to take a role in the exam review and working with the exam unit. She is also responsible for directing staff work on the strategic objectives adopted in the Board's strategic plan.

**D. Mental Health Services Act Coordinator's Report**

Christy Berger received a promotion and is the Board's new fulltime MHSA Coordinator underwritten by the Department of Mental Health (DMH). Ms. Berger's job is to serve as the Board's specialist regarding the MHSA and its impact on Board programs and its interrelationship with Board programs, to act as liaison between the Board and DMH, and to perform other functions relating to the MHSA. Her report will be included in future meetings.

**E. Future Board Meetings**

Mr. Riches reported that the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) is requesting a change in date for the November board meeting. The Director is working to develop a "board conference" where each board and bureau in DCA will hold its meeting at a common location over a 3-5 day period. In addition to the board meetings, the conference will feature training and networking opportunities for board members. The conference is designed to highlight the breadth of work done by DCA boards and bureaus and provide opportunities for board members from various boards and members of the administration to meet. The conference is slated to occur the week of November 17<sup>th</sup> in the Los Angeles area. The tentative schedule has the BBS meeting on Tuesday, November 18<sup>th</sup>.

In an effort to meet once a year in parts of the state that we normally do not attend, the August Board meeting will be held in Eureka.

The next Board meeting is scheduled on May 29-30, 2008 in Sacramento.

**F. Miscellaneous Matters**

There were no miscellaneous matters to report.

**VIII. Marriage and Family Therapist Education Committee Recommendation to Sponsor Legislation to Revise Education Requirements for Marriage and Family Therapists**

Dr. Russ requested from the Board to support approval of the work of the committee and move forward in the legislative process.

The Committee is proposing specific curricular changes for MFT intern registration and licensure. The proposal includes increasing the 48-semester unit requirement to 60 semester units. This will put some burdens on some schools and students. The needs and the demands of the field have expanded to allow MFTs to move into various fields. There is a lot of support from the institutions to implement this.

In addition, there is the integration of the Recovery Model. The Recovery Model is an issue of working with people. It is the model that DMH states is essential for the agencies it oversees and contracts with. People in mental health need to understand it and know it. It is an additional way of thinking and will be a challenge to the institutions.

The committee encouraged and infused throughout the curriculum the issues of cultures and socioeconomics. One of the things left unresolved is that the MFT requirements do not demand supervised meetings with families. The Board will have that conversation and talk about creating incentives for that.

Mr. Wong, NASW, asked if there is any language change to allow for regional accreditation rather than Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditations. Dr. Russ replied that there is a change allowing the use of accrediting agencies that are recognized by the Department of Education.

Ms. Riemersma, CAMFT, supports the proposal; however, she requested an amendment to Section 4980.02, to recognize these sections of law that are now becoming the education sections.

***Donna DiGiorgio moved to sponsor legislation to update the MFT educational requirements proposed. Renee Lonner seconded. The Board voted unanimously to pass the motion (8-0).***

Dr. Russ thanked the public for discussing this and developing these ideas.

Mr. Riches stated that Senate Bill 1218 authored by Senator Luke Correa is in print and available on the legislative website.

**IX. Policy and Advocacy Committee Report**

**A. Recommendation #1 – Sponsor Legislation Recognizing Schools Accredited by the Transnational Association of Christian Colleges and Schools**

Ms. DiGiorgio reported that current law recognizes three separate entities for approving/accrediting marriage and family therapy degree programs: WASC, Commission on Accreditation of Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE), and the Bureau of Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education (BPPVE). BPPVE became inoperative in July 2007. The BBS has been asked to add the Transnational Association of Christian Colleges and Schools (TRACS) as one of the accrediting bodies. The committee recommended that the Board sponsor legislation to recognize TRACS accreditation.

Ms. Riemersma, CAMFT, stated that CAMFT is in favor of the proposal.

***Karen Roye moved to sponsor legislation to recognize TRACS accreditation. Judy Johnson seconded. The Board voted unanimously (8-0) to pass the motion.***

**B. Legislation Update**

Mr. Riches provided a list of legislation for reference. The list contains legislation that the Board will introduce in the 2008 legislative session.

**C. Regulation Update**

Mr. Riches provided a list of pending rulemaking for reference.

Mr. Caldwell, AAMFT California Division, referred to the regulatory proposal Title 16, CCR Sections 1833.1 and 1870, Supervisor Qualifications. He stated that since that requirement has changed, he suggested removing the brochures from the board meeting packet.

Kristy Schieldge stated that the brochures have been updated to reflect the regulatory changes.

**X. Update on Proposed Legislation and Regulations Regarding Acceptance of Degrees Granted by Institutions Approved by the Bureau for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education**

Mr. Riches reported that at the November board meeting, staff was directed to: 1) to initiate rulemaking to extend recognition, and 2) to sponsor legislation granting the Board the authority to recognize approving accrediting bodies by regulation. That bill has been introduced and will be heard on March 11<sup>th</sup> at the Business and Professions Committee meeting.

The larger reform discussions continue. The latest is that there will probably be a formation of a legislative conference committee. This is a committee between the two houses that will meet and produce a report, and seek approval.

Ms. DiGiorgio asked what the timeline is for resolving this issue. Mr. Riches responded that there is a statutory extension that gets the BBS through the end of this year. His expectation is that if larger progress is not made, there may be another effort to extend this out one more year.

**XI. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**

No public comments were made

**XII. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items**

No suggestions were made.

The Board adjourned at 3:16 p.m.

## **BOARD COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

### **XIII. MFT Education Committee**

#### **Members Present**

Ian Russ, Chair, MFT Member  
Gordonna DiGiorgio, Public Member

#### **Staff Present**

Paul Riches, Executive Officer  
Mona Maggio, Assistant Executive Officer  
Kristy Schieldge, Legal Counsel  
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Assistant

#### **Members Absent**

None

Ian Russ, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. Christina Kitamura called roll, and a quorum was established.

#### **A. Review and Approval of December 7, 2007 Meeting Minutes**

Donna DiGiorgio moved to approve the December 7, 2007 meeting minutes. Ian Russ seconded. The Committee approved the motion.

The MFT Education Committee adjourned at 3:32 p.m.

### **XIV. Consumer Protection Committee**

#### **Members Present**

Judy Johnson, LEP Member  
Elise Froistad, MFT Member  
Victor Perez, Public Member  
Ian Russ, Chair, MFT Member  
Joan Walmsley, Vice Chair, LCSW Member

#### **Staff Present**

Paul Riches, Executive Officer  
Mona Maggio, Assistant Executive Officer  
Kristy Schieldge, Legal Counsel  
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Assistant

#### **Members Absent**

None

Judy Johnson, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. Christina Kitamura called roll, and a quorum was established.

#### **A. Review and Approval of the October 5, 2007 Meeting Minutes**

Victor Perez moved to approve the October 5, 2007 meeting minutes. Joan Walmsley seconded. The Committee voted unanimously (5-0) to pass the motion.

The Consumer Protection Committee adjourned at 3:33 p.m.

## **XV. Planning Committee**

### **Members Present**

Judy Johnson, Chair, LEP Member  
Ian Russ, MFT Member

### **Staff Present**

Paul Riches, Executive Officer  
Mona Maggio, Assistant Executive Officer  
Kristy Schieldge, Legal Counsel  
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Assistant

### **Members Absent**

D'Karla Leach, Public Member

Judy Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m. Christina Kitamura called roll, and a quorum was established.

The items were taken out of order with C. Strategic Plan Update provided first.

### **C. Strategic Plan Update**

Mona Maggio gave an update on the strategic plan's goals and objectives and the status of each team. The Champions for each objective have completed the first draft of their respective team's reporting document, which contains a work action plan (WAP) that details how they are going to achieve and meet the objective. The report will be given to the Strategic Planning Counsel (SPC), composed of 10 staff and management members, and chaired by Christy Berger. The SPC oversees the direction of the strategic plan.

The first drafts are due on February 15<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Berger and Ms. Maggio will review the reporting documents and provide feedback to the Champions. The reporting documents include:

- Introduction to the objective
- Identified challenges in addressing the objective
- Significance of the objective
- Methodology
- Discussion on how the team will meet the goals
- Current status
- Work action plan

One of the challenges experienced by the teams and the SPC is the loss of some personnel and recruitment of new team members and new Champions. Ms. Maggio will have more time to work with the Champions. The next SPC meeting is scheduled for March 12<sup>th</sup>.

The goal is to have some of the Champions present their objectives to the Board its the May meeting.

Ms. Maggio addressed Objective 2.2, implement four strategies to improve the quality of clinical supervision by July 1, 2012. The work on this objective is going well with the Supervision Workgroup and the research and information gained to create a draft supervision course.

Ms. Maggio addressed Objective 3.1, implement four consumer awareness initiatives on the roles of mental health services by July 1, 2012. Sean O'Connor, the Board's Outreach Coordinator, is the Champion for this objective. Mr. O'Connor's goal is to train additional staff in outreach presentations. The presentations are much needed and have become very popular; however, they are very time-consuming. Mr. O'Connor is training two

evaluators: Jessica Upadhye, LCSW evaluator, and Michelle Eernisse, MFT evaluator. The goal was to complete 45 outreach events this year. It appears that the goal will be exceeded.

Ms. Maggio addressed Objective 4.2, 90% of BBS staff will participate in the Human Resource management plan by July 1, 2010. Paula Gershon and Steve Sodergren are in the process of setting up a “board certification program” for staff to educate all staff in all areas of the Board and test staff on their general knowledge within the various units within the office. The anticipated date to begin the certification program is in April.

Mr. Riches stated that staff has expressed the desire to have better knowledge of the organization and the ability to communicate across organizational lines. It is also important at the management level to understand each unit, to spend time in each unit and experience what each unit does. This gives management more empathy about the people going through the Board’s processes and what that means on a subjective level.

Ms. Maggio addressed Objective 2.4, implement six strategies to improve the quality of treatment for co-occurring disorders by July 1, 2012. Christina Kitamura and Julie McAuliffe are the Champions for this objective. They contacted Donna DiGiorgio who has been a very good resource for them on getting some starting points, and giving them opportunities to ask questions. Some questions they are asking are how can the Board assist in education for licensees in co-occurring disorder, and is it in the Board’s purview.

Mr. Riches stated that from an organizational development standpoint, part of the strategic planning process is developing the Board objectives and developing tangible outcomes. There has also been a conscious effort on our part on how to implement that. It has been challenging, but this is very much about staff development and leadership development. We have turnover and aging workforce. We have a lot of very long-term employees and a lot of new employees. One of the things management has to do is to identify the individuals who have the interest, skills, and capability to progress and move up. This implementation effort is staff intensive. This is a good way to see who has the aptitude and interest, and the skill set needed to move up, and to develop a bench of good internal candidates so they are prepared to move up when the Board has openings.

**A. Review and Possible Action on Draft Board Self-Assessment Instrument**

Mr. Riches reported on Objective 1.7, increase board appointees’ effectiveness index by 10% by July 1, 2012. At its November 2007 meeting, the Board approved a methodology for assessing board member effectiveness that included ongoing self-assessment. The self-assessment is focused on the degree to which the Board’s activity as a governing body is exemplified.

One of the challenges was determining what it means to be an effective board member. Without a “job description,” there is no obvious answer. Some of the points talked about were: participation in public meetings, preparation, and engagement, collectively respecting the individual members and the individual members respecting the Board and its processes.

The best way to operationalize the question is to ask, “Are we fulfilling our values commitment?” Those values are articulated in the BBS Way:

Be a person of *integrity*.  
Be *dedicated* and *professional*.  
*Serve* with *excellence*.

Staff developed a range of questions based on how board members would exhibit the BBS Way in its public conduct. Accordingly, each question is listed according to the value it reflected. Four questions were drafted under each value. Staff is requesting feedback as to which four questions per value fit best or suggestions for alternate questions.

### ***Integrity***

Staff drafted four questions. No comments were made.

### ***Professionalism***

Ms. Johnson recommended omitting question 1: Does the Board listen openly to all points of view? This question is subsumed in question 2: Does the Board openly accept and respond to constructive criticism? She also recommended omitting question 4: Does the Board engage in constructive self-evaluation?

Ms. Johnson stated that the following questions were excellent:

2. Does the Board openly accept and respond to constructive criticism?
3. Does the Board respect and value the roles of all professions and consumers?
5. Does the Board hold its members accountable for supporting organizational norms and values?
6. Does the Board hold the executive officer accountable for effective staff operations and implementing Board policy?

Ian Russ agreed with Ms. Johnson's recommendations.

Janlee Wong, Executive Director of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) California Chapter, asked how the Board measures its knowledge base. All of the board members should have a general knowledge in policy making. One way to evaluate that is by testing the board members. He stated there should be some understanding of the recovery model among all of the board members.

### ***Dedication***

Ms. Johnson stated that questions under "Dedication" address issues such as holding people accountable for having a knowledge base and doing their homework with respect to the areas of expertise that everyone brings to the Board.

1. Is the Board prepared to address the issues on each agenda?
2. Does the Board respect and support the priorities of each board member?
3. Does the Board actively seek information and expertise from external sources?
4. Does the Board respond to public demand to address issues of concern?

Mary Riemersma, Executive Director of the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (CAMFT), stated that staff did a good job as a start to create a tool to evaluate the effectiveness and operation of the Board as a whole. She encouraged the Board to work with it for a while and change it as needed.

Dr. Russ asked the audience if the discussion reflects that there is a lack of general knowledge and if the community feels that there is a lack of knowledge on the Board.

Ms. Riemersma expressed that it is refreshing to see the Board is knowledgeable about what it is doing, and where it is not knowledgeable, the Board seeks that knowledge.



Olivia Loewy, Executive Director of the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) California Division, stated that this a good way to provide guidelines and awareness for board members in what they are supposed to do as a Board.

Heather Halperin, University of Southern California, School of Social Work, expressed that it is enlightening that the Board is willing to look at itself and is very active and interested in making the community a part of its processes. She asked how the Board evaluates itself if there is a lack of presence from other members.

Mr. Riches explained that there are objective elements such as attendance, submitting enforcement votes timely, and participation in Board outreach efforts and community outreach efforts. These are easily quantifiable and will be wrapped in through this instrument. This instrument is intended to target the issue of the Board collectively functioning well.

Charlene Gonzales, Department of Child and Family Services, expressed that she is impressed by the openness of the Board, and it is a less scary being part of the process. She feels that the processes are limited towards the licensed school psychologist (LEP) profession, and the licensed clinical social worker (LCSW) profession is seldom discussed.

Dr. Russ responded that there will be a lot of discussion this year regarding the LCSW, with the creation of the LCSW Education Committee.

Ms. Johnson responded that there was a full discussion regarding LEPs at the Fresno board meeting. Mr. Riches added that there was a comprehensive rewrite of the LEP statutes.

Mr. Wong asked if there is a method to determine if board members have knowledge regarding the strategic plan goals and what those measurements are. Ms. Johnson responded that this is addressed under "Excellence."

### ***Service***

Staff drafted four questions. No comments were made.

### ***Excellence***

Ms. Johnson recommended omitting question 5: Is the Board an effective policymaking body? Question 5 is redundant with question 3: Is the Board open to adapting its policies and practices based on changes in its environment?

Ms. Johnson recommended omitting question 7: Is board member interaction healthy and respectful? This is addressed under "Professionalism."

Dr. Russ agreed with Ms. Johnson.

The four questions that were most effective were:

1. Does the Board exhibit a proactive approach to understanding and addressing public needs?
2. Does the Board exhibit responsiveness to the challenges presented by public and professional diversity?
3. Is the Board open to adapting its policies and practices based on changes in its environment?
4. Does the Board exhibit commitment to the priorities established by its strategic plan?

Mr. Riches stated that staff will bring this to the Board at its meeting May for approval, and plan to administer the survey after the August board meeting.

Mr. Riches briefly reported on his upcoming trip to Las Vegas to attend the conference of the American Society for Business and Behavioral Sciences. He will present a paper that he co-authored with Dr. Lindle Hatton about the aspects of the Board's current planning process, which will be submitted to their journal for possible publication. Dr. Hatton and Mr. Riches may be writing future papers in this effort.

Dr. Russ read the paper and expressed that it is an excellent paper that introduces what the Board is doing. It moves the Board forward in the mission to be exemplary in how boards should operate. It is a model.

**B. Brainstorming Session on Improving Board Member Participation in Outreach Events**

Ms. Maggio reported that as a component of Objective 1.7, there is an opportunity for board members to participate in outreach events in community engagements and in the mental health communities, and in regularly scheduled board meetings and board activities.

Ms. Johnson asked if board members are notified of outreach events, do the members know when there are events, and are there extra events that members can attend. Ms. Maggio responded that notification is sent to the board members informing them of events that staff will be attending.

Ms. Maggio questioned if board members are aware of other outreach events, or if there were events that the community would like to invite a board member to attend.

Dr. Russ would like to survey the board members and ask if they are:

- Involved in the community,
- Attending events for professional organizations, and
- Attending events where staff is requesting their presence.

Ms. Johnson recommended keeping a log of extended events where the board member represented the Board, attended as a representative of the Board, and/or getting involved in the dialogue.

Mr. Riches asked what is a useful way to share information to about the organized outreach events. What would be an effective way to stimulate participation?

Dr. Russ suggested:

- Sending a general announcement of the events,
- Requesting participation of a board member who is logistically/geographically close to the event, and
- Sending a general announcement to all board members for events not geographically convenient to any of the members.

Ms. Johnson suggested sending the same notifications to all board members and provide a tool to document all the events that were attended.

Kristy Schieldge warned against board-related discussions when at events, as it violates the Open Meeting Act.

No further discussion.

The Planning Committee adjourned at 4:34 pm.

***Friday, February 22***

***FULL BOARD OPEN SESSION***

Members Present

Ian Russ, Chair, MFT Member  
Elise Froistad, MFT Member  
Judy Johnson, LEP Member  
Karen Roye, Public Member  
Renee Lonner, LCSW Member  
Victor Perez, Public Member  
Joan Walmsley, Vice Chair, LCSW Member  
Gordonna DiGiorgio, Public Member

Staff Present

Paul Riches, Executive Officer  
Mona Maggio, Assistant Executive Officer  
Christy Berger, MHSA Coordinator  
Kristy Schieldge, Legal Counsel  
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Assistant

Members Absent

Victor Law, Public Member  
D'Karla Leach, Public Member  
Rita Cameron Wedding, Public Member

Guests

Norman Hertz, Examination Consultant  
Nancy Linn, OER Staff Supervisor  
Sonja Merold, Chief of OER

Ian Russ called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. Christina Kitamura called roll, and a quorum was established.

***FULL BOARD CLOSED SESSION***

Dr. Russ closed the meeting to the public at 8:35 a.m.

**XVI. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(1) Regarding Administration of Licensing Examinations for Marriage and Family Therapists, Licensed Clinical Social Workers and Licensed Educational Psychologists.**

The Board adjourned at 11:51 a.m.